DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 459 768 IR 058 262

AUTHOR	Muennich, Monika
TITLE	Progress on the Multilingual Dictionary of Cataloging Terms and Concepts.
PUB DATE	2001-08-00
NOTE	10p.; In: Libraries and Librarians: Making a Difference in the Knowledge Age. Council and General Conference: Conference Programme and Proceedings (67th, Boston, MA, August 16-25, 2001); see IR 058 199.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.ifla.org.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Bibliographic Records; *Cataloging; *Dictionaries; Foreign Countries; International Programs; *Material Development; *Multilingual Materials; *Standards
IDENTIFIERS	International Federation of Library Associations; United States

ABSTRACT

This paper proposes a new multilingual dictionary, to be created under the auspices of IFLA (International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions) that will cover the terms and concepts of cataloging. The first section provides some examples that demonstrate the necessity for such a dictionary. The second section lists the following documents to be utilized: ISBD (International Standard Bibliographic Description), FRBR (Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records), GARR (Guidelines for Authority Records and References), AACR (Anglo-American Cataloging Rules), Dublin Core, and machine-readable bibliographic communication formats. The third section addresses the selection of words or phrases to be included in the dictionary; a list of words relating to cataloging description and objects to be cataloged is attached. The fourth section discusses the following topics related to annotations/explanations: (1) examples of different philosophies in national rules and/or different handling of formats; (2) the language of definitions and explanations in the dictionary; and (3) source book notations. The fifth section suggests that the dictionary should not include gender, flexion/grammar specialties, or pronunciation. The sixth section covers briefly the technical aspects of input and selection of a database. The seventh section summarizes national responsibilities and communications. The final section describes the next steps. Examples of English-German translation of terms are attached. (MES)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 459 768

67th IFLA Council and General Conference August 16-25, 2001

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A.L. Van Wesemael

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Code Number: 093-152a-E
Division Number: IV
Professional Group: Cataloguing
Joint Meeting with: -
Meeting Number: 152a
Simultaneous Interpretation: -

Progress on the Multilingual Dictionary of Cataloging Terms and Concepts

Monika Muennich
Senior Cataloguer, Universitäts Bibliothek,
Heidelberg, Germany

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Abstract:

Inspite of the existence of quite a few dictionaries of library terms there is a need for a new dictionary that covers the very specific terms and concepts of cataloging and the objects to be cataloged. The dictionary will comprise terms of "official" international documents esp. IFLA documents such as ISBDs, FRBR, GARR; Anglo-American international documents such as AACR, Dublin Core and machine-readable formats such as MARC21 and UNIMARC and national documents in comparison. The dictionary will have annotations and explanations in order to explain differences beyond the simple definitions in international and national use of terms. The source language will be English – according to the above mentioned documents - with as many target languages as possible. The dictionary will be created under the auspices of IFLA; the members – IFLA membership is not mandatory - will work on a voluntary basis; the future database should be freely accessible on IFLANET.

The dictionary is supposed to be a practical aid, not a linguistic instrument. It should provide a thorough clarification of cataloging issues to enable worldwide understanding of terms, other rule sets, and concepts. It should enable catalogers to contribute to international discussions on rule sets and help with providing wording for new concepts.

In my long career I have used or cataloged many dictionaries. Proposing a new multilingual dictionary myself still frightens me at times! But I am sure that a strong need exists for a dictionary in the special field of cataloging.

IR058262

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1 Necessity for another dictionary?

I would like to begin with the question, do we really need a new dictionary of this sort?

To answer this, I should give a few examples based on personal experiences:

- *International conferences* such as IFLA, OCLC (authority control), Toronto (AACR Revision), etc.

  Whenever I discuss conference papers with my German colleagues I have the feeling that a thorough understanding has been very difficult to achieve. Thdictionary by Eberhard Sauppe[1] certainly is of help, but whenever special fields with differences in rule sets or bibliographic 7 were involved there is no answer – indeed, there *cannot be* any answer in Sauppe.

- *REUSE*

  In the REUSE project[2] – a project of Göttingen State Library and OCLC with Dr. Barbara Tillett (LC) and me as consultants – the differences between the rules sets AACR and RAK-WB[3] were analyzed in order to make "re-using" each other's bibliographic data easier and less expensive. In this project we frequently had a hard time understanding each other! Some examples were terms like "differentiated headings," "multipart works", or "series".

- *AACR2r Translation into German[4] Project*

  Finally, this project confirmed and encouraged the desire to build a multilingual dictionary of cataloging. In this project, the glossary was first translated by a few colleagues, then a team of American, British, German, and Swiss librarians started the translation of the different chapters with revision by the others. We discussed quite a few translated words and phrases which enriched a so called *Translation Help* (see transparency 2), which I had developed during the project. We put the tables of contents for the chapters as standard translations on the internet; but when I started to translate the index in summer 2000 – looking up the *different* translations of the words in the translated chapters - all of us saw the priority for a common, standard, detailed vocabulary with explanations: a very lively discussion is still going on in our online listserv.

Given these and other experiences: YES - we do need this dictionary.

And we need this dictionary in many languages - as many as possible in order to integrate as many colleagues as possible in disscussions of cataloging rules and concepts worldwide.

2 Documents to be utilized

The IFLA Section of Cataloging agreed that the dictionary should only comprise words from international and national "official documents, such as"

- **ISBDs** (*International Standard Bibliographical Description*)
- **FRBR** (*Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records*[5])
- **GARR** (*Guidelines for Authority Records and References*[6])

It has to be discussed – especially in IFLA's Section on Cataloguing – if other IFLA documents are to be included.

---

[1] Sauppe, Eberhard: Dictionary of Librarianship – Wörterbuch des Bibliothekswesens. 2nd ed., Saur 1996
[2] URL: http://www.oclc.org/oclc/cataloging/reuse_project/index.htm
[3] Regeln für die alphabetische Katalogisierung – in wissenschaftlichen Bibliotheken. 2. überarb. Ausg. Deutsches Bibliotheksinstitut, Berlin 1993.
[4] URL: http://lcweb.loc.gov/loc/german/AACR2/AACR2translation.html
[5] Saur 1998 – URL: http://ifla.inist.fr/V/saur.htm#UBCIMnew
[6] Saur 2001 - so far not on IFLANET

- **AACR - National rules in comparison**
- **Dublin Core (DC)**

  The Dublin Core Metadata scheme introduced many new "terms" that now require "official" translations, too.

- **Machine-Readable Bibliographic Communication Formats**

  MARC 21 and UNIMARC as basis

  There is still a question about bibliographic formats. Actually, I am convinced that machine-readable formats should be included. Catalogers are used to speaking in "tags" at least as often, if not more frequently, than referring to cataloging rules or ISBD areas of description.

  I recommend that terms found in the MARC 21 format and the UNIMARC format become the base list for this part of the vocabulary. National formats (as in Germany: MAB[7]) should become the translation basis, as far as applicable. Explanations should be included if applications are different.

3 Selection of words / phrases

The selections of words or phrases is another discussion point:

There is no doubt that all words and phrases concerning description and entries ("title proper", "date of edition", "accompanying material", "entered subordinately" - to mention only a few) should be included in the dictionary. But what about the objects catalogers have to describe or technical terms of the computer or film industries used in bibliographic description, or what about the terms used in controlled access forms of names, such as designations of leaders of foreign countries, complicated legislative bodies and designations?

I think these phrases/concepts have to be included, because the existing rules (above all AACR) prescribe how the cataloger has to handle these. Especially in comparing national rule sets, these materials, terms, and concepts must be defined and understood.

See TRANSPARENCY 1 with a list of words relating to cataloging description and entry words and objects to be cataloged.

4 Annotations / explanations

4.1 Examples for different philosophy in national rules and/or different handling of formats

I would like to present some examples:

- **Collection** – one of many examples for translation variations between AACR and RAK: collection means "Sammlung" - a collection of two or more works **by one author**

  but also "Sammelwerk" - a collection of two or more works **by different authors.**

- **Multipart items and Multi-volume works**[8] - an example for differences in rule sets and bibliographic formats:

  Within Anglo-American cataloging, there are several options for handling works that contain other works, the whole-part concept, regardless of whether presented physically as one or more volumes,

---

[7] Maschinelles Austauschformat für Bibliotheken. 2. Aufl. 1996, Die Deutsche Bibliothek

[8] URLs: http://www.biblio.tu-bs.de/allegro/formate/reusep.htm and
http://www.oclc.org/oclc/cataloging/reuse_project/english_summary.htm

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and there are rules for describing works issued in several physical parts (whether containing a single or multiple works). The rules provide several options for cataloging such materials:

1. by cataloging only the whole work - *usually when the separate physical parts have no variations in titles and/or contain no other "works" – showing the multiple volumes in the physical description (MARC 21 tag 300$a),*
2. by cataloging the whole work and including a contents note (MARC 21 tag 505) to identify the parts (with or without corresponding added entries (MARC 21 tags 7XX)) – *usually for a single volume containing multiple works or a multi-volume set with multiple works*,
3. by cataloging the whole (or creating just an authority record for the whole, as in the case for some series) plus separate records for the individual parts (analytics) linked to the "whole" through either a series statement (MARC 21 tag 4XX) or an "In analytic" note – *usually for parts of a monographic series*, or
4. by using a multilevel description as desribed in AACR2, rule 13.6 - *usually for things like manuscript collections*:

   In this latter rule, AACR2 suggests to "divide the descriptive information into two or more levels ... "

   but

   - MARC 21 provides for all of these options;
   - UKMARC has the added option beyond the options in MARC 21 of using a special title field tag for subordinate works when described within one bibliographic record;
   - MAB, the German exchange format, uses different records for the item as a whole and for each of the volumes - as we see below:

   The structure of multi-volume works in German rules is divided into a

   - ***Record for the collective title,*** the item as a whole with the relevant bibliographic statements,

     as author / corporate body (links to authority files):

     title proper / statement of responsibility. - publ. place : publisher and notes etc.

     and

   - ***Records for each volume*** with the bibliographic statements relating to the volume

     authors / corp. bodies (links to authority files):

     6title proper / statement of responsibility. - edition statement. - publication year. - physical description. - collective title ; volume (***and*** *upward link to collective title record by ID-Nr)*

   Volume records are also made if the volume has no distinctive title.

- **Conferences of corporate bodies**

The "conference example" is a typical case of non-matching entities within corporate bodies.

In AACR a conference of a corporate body can be a subordinate entry under corporate body

(the purpose of this is to collocate the conference publications in large files):

[heading] International Labor Organisation. European Regional Conference (2nd : 1968 : Geneva, Switzerland)

[title] Second European Regional Conference ...

In RAK there is no subordination, these conferences are publications of the body itself:

[heading] International Labor Organisation

[title] Second European Regional Conference ...

4.2 Language of definitions and explanations

It should be discussed where and how the definitions/explanations/annotations are presented in the multilingual dictionary:

Definitions from the ISBDs, FRBR, AACR, Dublin Core are adopted from the English source into the English base list part of the dictionary (see 6). The explanation of the differences or difficulties in national concepts should be indicated in the English section and be explained in the respective national fields. These explanations should be made in the respective language as well as in English. I am not sure how detailed the explanations/annotations should be. We will have to discuss this on the lists.

4.3 Source book notations

I consider a source book notation very important. There are differences between AACR, ISBD, FRBR, Dublin Core, and the communication formats, and it is helpful to indicate the source. In case of matching vocabulary (as in AACR and ISBD), two [and] or more sources may be given.

5 No grammatical / linguistic terms and explanations

The dictionary team has to decide if the dictionary is "simply" a cataloger's tool or a sophisticated linguistic instrument which will require a considerable amount of additional linguistic input (which I certainly believe that most of my colleagues are able to provide). I think our goal is not a linguistic tool and that's why I propose to include neither gender, nor flexion or grammar specialties, nor pronunciation.

The dictionary should rather be a practical aid for librarians, which includes both aids to understanding other rule sets and aids to formulating new/other concepts.

I think that all members of IFLA Section on Cataloguing would like the idea that as many national ideas as possible could be included in any future international set of rules – partly with the help of this newly created tool.

6 Input / Database

6.1 Input

I am very happy to announce that Dr. Gerhard Risthuis from Amsterdam University will take care of the technical part. He proposes that the input can be made with a word processor (with the UNICODE - UTF-9 - encoding). The input should be a tagged text file. The file should comprise the following tags:

For the source language - which is English:

the *entry word* (the word or phrase that forms an entry), *the source, definition and source of definition* (if there are different source definitions) - if necessary an explanation, the *definition(s); reference to related terms, reference to synonyms.*

For each target language:

the *translated entry word, the source, translated definition and source* (if there are [more] several), *explanations/annotations* if the translated terms have different meanings in the national rule set or format; *reference to related terms, synonyms* - if they match words of the source language.

6.2 Database

The final decision which database will be chosen will be made by Dr. Risthuis and the Chair of the Section on Cataloging, Dr. Barbara Tillett. There are several concepts in discussion so far.

The database should be free of charge for IFLA members – or possibly made available for purchase at low cost. The database should be freely accessible on IFLANET.

It can be discussed whether national (English and target language) paper editions should be created.

7 National responsibilities and communication

There should be one to three persons responsible in a country or language area. At least one of these colleagues should be an IFLA member, but this is not mandatory. The colleagues should be catalogers or at least have very detailed knowledge of cataloging rules and bibliographic formats.

It goes without saying that this work will be carried out on a voluntary basis under the auspices of IFLA.

We will create e-mail discussion groups with cataloging experts who have a fairly good knowledge of English in order to achieve a reliable vocabulary and vocabulary structure. I actually propose:

- One common list for the persons responsible as a means of communication about such things as which words or phrases should be accepted for the English base list - a *Source Discussion List*.
- A "dual" group of lists: one for each target language area. Participation of Anglo-American colleagues with knowledge of the target language would be very helpful.

  As for the English / German part, I will ask some of the American colleagues of the AACR translation team to participate in this IFLA dictionary. These dual national lists could provide communication for the "official" translation of the target language. It would also be necessary to discuss national rule idiosyncracies in comparison to AACR2r (ISBD's, etc.) to introduce annotations and explanations.

8 Conclusions and next steps

To summarize: the new IFLA multilingual dictionary should be a practical aid. It should provide a thorough clarification of cataloging issues to enable worldwide understanding of terms, other rule sets, and concepts. It should enable catalogers to contribute to international discussions on rule sets and help with formulating new concepts.

So far we have only spoken of descriptive cataloging. I could well imagine that in a second phase subject cataloging terms and concepts could be included. But the first phase should be well underway before we integrate another large area of problems.

Next steps:

I hope to address all IFLA colleagues who are interested in participation during this IFLA General Conference. These colleagues could address further specialists in their countries.

A realistic start date for the working stage could be spring 2002 - to my mind. By then the German AACR Translation Project[9] will hopefully be finished and I think the input file could be ready as well by this time. I have asked Maria Witt - the Section Secretary - to establish an IFLA listserv: a source list and general discussion list that could include technical aspects such as tagging etc.

[9] for the newest edition: http://lcweb.loc.gov/loc/german/AACR2/glossaries/transhelp.htm

The first input of the source language and the target language German could be the Translation Help I constructed with many colleagues during the AACR translation. I know the Slovenian colleagues have made a multilingual dictionary of ISBD-terms. This could also be a wonderful base list - I am sure they will permit us to do so. There are several other older national translation projects that could be included as well.

I do hope we can announce the start of the input in Glasgow.

Thank you

Monika Münnich, University Library of Heidelberg, Germany

for the IFLA Section on Cataloging

Transparenca 1 - **Selection of Words and phrases**

Cataloging techniques	*Objects to be cataloged*
access points	**acoustic sound recordings**
analytic added entry	**armed services**
bibliographic citations	**ballad opera**
bound with	**bill**
cataloging agency	**cartridge / chip cartridge**
chief source of information	**close score**
collation	**complainant**
compiler	**computer optical cards**
date area	**dubbed motion pictures**
early cartographic material	**ecclesiastical principality**
entry element	**edge track**
explanatory notes	**esquire**
family name	**film loops**
function of publisher	**fraternal order**
generic term	**groove characteristics**
hyphenated	**hereditary rulers**
illustrative matter	**impeachment**

initial article	indictments
joint pseudonyms	jurisdiction arbitral
level of description	laws governing one jurisdiction
multilevel description	military court
name of publisher	newscasts
order of elements	ordinary of the Mass
punctuation	Pali canon
reference source	reel-to-reel tapes
series statement	sees
spacing	stands of globes
terms of availibility	tosefta
vernacular	Vishnu
works of mixed responsibility	woodwind quartets

TRANSPARENCY 2 **Examples from the Translation Help**

Translation Help for AACR2 translation project

A (4/08)

English Term	German Term	AACR Soource
abbreviation	Abkürzung	index, App. B, uö.
abridgement abridgements	Kürzung Kurzfassung	Index, 1.1E3, 1.4D2 ua 21.12
access (manuscr. + electr. res.) restriction of	Zugang (zu Handschr.), Zugriff auf elektr. R. Zugangsbeschränkung.	index, 4.7B14, 1.7B20, 9.7B20
access points	Eintragungsstellen	21, App. D
accession	Neuerwerbung	index: inclus. dates ...
accompanying material *s.a.* supplementary m.	Begleitmaterial	index, uö.
according to (*s.a.* order of preference)	gemäß ... (folgender Reihenfolge)	22.2A1
account book	Geschäftsbuch	index, 4.1B2
acoustic recordings	Akustische Aufzeichnungen	index, 6.7B10
acronyms	Initialenfolge	index, uö.
(are/were) active *s.a.* country of residence	... gewirkt haben	22.3B4 ua.
activity card	Ereigniskarte	Index, App. D, 1.1C1, 8.5B1
adaption	Bearbeitung	1.7B2
added entry	Nebeneintragung	Anh. D
added to	(als) Zusatz zu	index unter academic